



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

. . . Tolstoy has written a preface for a new biography of William Lloyd Garrison, which is about to be published in English by the Russian house of Tchertkoff, in London. Tolstoy has always greatly admired Garrison, who was a consistent advocate of non-resistance, long before the Russian Count took the matter up, and this preface is devoted very largely to a discussion of this subject in its many bearings.

. . . As a result of the great reduction in the budget occasioned by her pacific agreements with Argentina, Chile will be able by the end of this year to redeem her paper money. For the next year it is estimated that the receipts will surpass the expenditures by twenty-two million piastres. The money received for the two warships sold is being spent for the improvement of the docks of Valparaiso and other ports.

### The Passion of Peace.

BY EDWIN ARNOLD BRENHOLTZ.

The passion for Peace has preëmpted my soul.  
How can words that work otherwise issue from me!

I recall how Revenge roved abroad in my life;  
How the work of the world seemed to sanctify strife;  
How the slaughter on battlefields seemed a necessity;—  
How I loathed all the years that had yielded to Peace.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*  
For I pictured this Peace as a weakling whose baseness bred  
cowards; whose miser-insanity stultified souls; whose  
willess supineness sent *manhood* to death—  
For I fed on the lies War delivered with unction;  
I believed;  
But I ne'er had beheld in her passion this Power eternal.

I accepted as hers miscalled children of Cowardice.  
I surprised Peace (and knew her) with passion unspeakable,  
passing them by.

I was stirred to my soul, and spake instantly, sternly:  
“Art thou then not the mother of these; of the vices that riot  
when War is withholden; of the crimes we accept as thy  
children, brought forth when the Nations are resting from  
slaughter, in the years when we yield to soft Pity’s  
enticements?”

Oh, the passion, impelling, that leaped to her eyes!  
Oh, the loathing that looked where that progeny flourished!  
Oh, the longing, the love unappeased that pervaded the answer:  
“I am virgin; awaiting one day that denies War’s dominion;  
awaiting to welcome the soul that has never mistaken War’s  
children and Greed’s as the fruit of my body, my soul’s  
reproduction.”

I am peace; I am virgin;—and waiting the day of espousal.”  
Oh, the passion that spoke from the soul I encountered!  
Oh, the long years of waiting, to make myself worthy!  
For the passion for Peace has preëmpted my soul!

“Still lives for Earth, which friends so long have trod,  
The great hope resting on the truth of God,—  
Evil shall cease and Violence pass away,  
And the tired world breathe free through a long Sabbath day.”

—Whittier.

### Address (condensed) of Leonard Courtney at the British National Peace Con- gress, Manchester, Eng., June 22.

We are met at a time which, I am afraid, cannot be said to be very favorable to the cause of peace. The facts of life which we have to face and acknowledge, and which it would be not only foolish but criminal to ignore, are at the present not favorable to our hopes. We are witnessing a very severe war, a war of a new character, which is not only severe but promises or threatens to last—a war between a great European Power and an Asiatic Power which shows at least the capacity to meet, if not to the end upon equal terms, at all events for a time upon terms really superior, the European Power.

That is not all. We have to witness what is evidently the beginning of a war between ourselves and a country which has given no offense, save that of desiring to be left alone. [Cheers.] In opening up this war we are disregarding all the experiences of our predecessors; we are neglecting the lessons which have been supposed to be accumulated by the history of our own past.

These are facts which thrust themselves before us in contemplating the operations of the world. But I think we have something more to acknowledge as weighing against our hopes and our aims than the facts, important as they are, of the war between Russia and Japan and the expedition which we have sent into Thibet. We have to recognize the state of feeling amongst civilized countries, which is one always pregnant with danger of war, instead of the old desire for pacific relations. Instead of a temper of trust and confidence in our neighbors, there has come over Europe and there is extending beyond Europe into the continent of America a temper of aggression, a temper of annexation, a temper of extension of influence and authority which is most threatening to the future peace of the world. How is such a temper to be met, how is it to be assuaged, how is it, if possible, to be laid to rest?

The one answer, which may not seem to be a hopeful answer, which I would give at the outset, is that it is only to be met by the conversion of men, by bringing home to individuals a sense of the iniquity of war, by getting them seized with a sense of the beauty of peace; it is by creating in them something like a passion for the pacific settlement of disputes and a dwelling together in brotherhood of the nations of mankind. It is by these, and these only, that we can ensure the development of peace throughout the world.

This is no new doctrine, no new teaching; and it seems very little to advance us in carrying forward our aims and in fulfilling our hopes. Yet we must fall back upon it, discouraging as the past may have been, unsatisfactory as the prospect of the present may be—we must fall back upon this as the real hope of the future; and even now, looking about us, looking at other nations and looking at our own, we are not without some hopes that the struggle between good and bad, though not always successful, is still one in which we shall win. Some progress has been made, even in recent days, towards the goal we desire to reach. We have seen a movement towards arbitration, which has resulted in

treaties between ourselves and France and between ourselves and Italy, and which promises in some way, perhaps not too definitely, the acquisition of a treaty between ourselves and the United States, and may lead to other treaties between European nations. These treaties have been for the pacific settlement of disputes by arbitration, not of all disputes, only of a limited number or a limited class of disputes; but it is a beginning, and one which we believe will by its success develop and multiply, so that the principle of arbitration, adopted at first only in a limited number of cases, will be extended to a large number in the end. It is encouraging that in the agreements which have been entered into there is an increasing tendency to refer disputes not to arbitrators chosen for the occasion, under the influence, it may be, of passions and excitements which arise out of international disputes, but to that Court the establishment of which is the other great fact upon which we can look with satisfaction in a review of the recent history of Europe.

The reference to the Court of The Hague, as a standing tribunal, of differences arising amongst civilized nations is, in fact, the commencement of a disposition to substitute law instead of force as the great power that will set at rest disputes among men. In endeavoring to infuse amongst our neighbors, and especially amongst the young, that passionate desire for peace, I would have our friends not to attempt to deny that war sometimes, indeed often, may be illustrated by virtues—by the virtues, such as they are, which war may develop and bring to the front,—but they are virtues which are possible, and more than possible, that are likely to occur, in the sphere of peace. Under peace such virtues are untrammelled and unspoilt by the hideous concomitants that circle round the events that we recognize as noble in the story of war.

Take, for instance, this last contest, which we are now looking upon with sorrow. There are events which have happened in it to which it would be idle to deny some meed of praise. When those Russian ships came out of Chemulpho they came out to certain defeat, and probably death to a large number of those who emerged from the inner harbor. But the men who came, came seriously, soberly, consciously, to yield to what they believed to be a necessity of self-sacrifice, to yield to something outside and greater than themselves, to attempt to do the duty which they owed to the community of which they were the symbols and the emissaries. This was an act which not only schoolboys but historians will have to recognize as an act of heroism comparable to the great acts which are told us of Greece and Rome. So, again, the Japanese who preferred to go down with the transport ships still more recently rather than yield to the enemy, when called upon to surrender, have exhibited a virtue which men of peace must recognize, and must feel even constrained to admire. But these virtues, as I have said, are not virtues which are only possible in war. We may have self-sacrifice in peace. Men may go and men have gone to meet death in the noble work not of injuring one another, but of attempting to help them. Mutual help often requires self-sacrifice, and the devotion to the good not only of your country but of all mankind requires you to be ready to meet any fate, and the virtues

which are the virtues of war may be, and often have been, repeated in the story of peace.

There is yet another sphere in which, I think, something may be done to promote the maintenance of peace amongst the nations. Why is it that within the nation, within each civilized nation, peace has been secured? Why is it that within this realm of England we no longer see armed retainers fighting at the bidding of barons and chieftains, and the whole country the scene of strife and conflict? The great strength of peace in England, the great strength of peace within every country that is civilized, lies in the belief, not merely that ease and comfort and plenty can be best secured by abstinence from the destructive energies of war, but that through law, and through the peaceful administration of law, justice, equity, right between man and man is most assured and most certain.

It is because of the confidence that our institutions administer justice that we have got the internal peace in which we rejoice, and when that confidence disappears it matters not what army of policemen you may have, it matters not how strong may be your martial forces, your internal peace also has gone. We saw that in our own country not very long ago. We had got all the resources of civilization, but peace had departed because there appeared to be, rightly or wrongly, in the minds of a considerable section of the population, a belief that the institutions of the country no longer worked righteousness and no longer secured justice.

It appears to me that the analogy presented by the spectacle of nations within themselves may suggest the best possible means of maintaining the spirit of peace and of assisting the development of peace. The more we can assure the nations of the world that justice between themselves can be secured by pacific means, the more certain will be the departure from all resort to arms. In this way one hails with the greatest satisfaction the agreements which in the last few months have been accomplished between the nations of Europe—that grand work of setting up a Court at The Hague, which is, above and beyond all other, established for referring disputes for arbitration. All this machinery tends towards the maintenance—the development and maintenance—of the faith that equity, right dealing and good conduct between nations may be secured by an institution set up between nations more certainly, more really, more truly by the pacific means of law than by the barbarous means of war.

But there is something beyond and beside these specific agreements. What is international law? We hear a good deal about it, but what does it mean? Here, I think, we ought to recognize the excellence of a set of principles suggested by the rules of equity and conduct and justice within nations, and applied tentatively, bit by bit, in a continuous and increasing degree. International law is not, like municipal law, strictly defined, strictly organized, strictly guaranteed. It is to some extent always in a state of growth, but certain leading principles of it have come to be recognized by all civilized nations. Others are half-recognized, others only just suggested as international law, but in each case it has gone on, now for two centuries or more, growing and growing. In our own time it has grown, and, with the assistance of the British people and the assistance of

other civilized nations, may go on growing until the power of international law becomes something between nations like the power of municipal law which operates within a nation. How can we help the growth of this international law, which has grown up, as I said, partly by the suggestion of national equity, wrought through municipal organization, and has been largely indebted to the energetic thought of some great thinkers who have occupied themselves with this problem? It has also grown out of the experience of nations, and statesmen who govern nations, who have learned the dangers out of which wars spring, and who have found principles through the action of which wars may be averted.

Now these principles have been developed largely in times of war, through the energetic attention that neutrals have paid to the conduct of those who have engaged in war, and through the decisive remonstrances neutrals have from time to time made against the actions of belligerents; because two great nations, entering upon war, do not confine the effect of their conduct to themselves—they are continually doing something which affects others, also. The other people remonstrate sometimes with energy and firmness. Out of the remonstrances of neutrals have come to be elaborated principles which have been accepted by all civilized nations, and which now form what you may call additional acts in the statute-book of international law.

Take, for example, privateering. Privateering was a mode of warfare very irregular, easily abused, and capable of degenerating into something not far from piracy. But privateering was a convenient and effective weapon in the hand of the power which could retain the greatest mastery of the seas; and it was insisted on by great maritime countries as a legitimate weapon. But neutrals objected, and resisted, and at last, half a century ago,—at the close of the Crimean War,—it was agreed that privateering, which had been practically abandoned during that war, should not again be resumed, but should be declared abolished. It was a new principle adopted between nations, due largely to the fact that neutrals had declared their refusal to allow the practice to pass without remonstrance, and without—if they were driven to it—adopting some means of preventing it. In the same way there arose the principle that “free ships make free goods,”—that is to say, that when two nations are at war, as Great Britain, for example, with France, Great Britain should not be at liberty to take out of an American ship goods that belonged to a Frenchman, on the plea that they were the goods of a subject of a hostile nation. We used to insist that we could take the goods of an enemy, wherever found; but neutrals said “No.” Neutrals for a long time had to yield; but they grew in power, their remonstrances acquired weight, and a sense of the justice of the remonstrance came to be felt. So at the end of the Treaty of Paris the nations of Europe agreed that henceforward free ships should make free goods, contraband of war only excepted; and a new principle was added to the other principles of international law.

Now, international law being a growing thing, its principles being those which from time to time are extended, as the ideas of justice between nations became more and more clear and more and more definite, and as the possibilities of keeping war within bounds

and regulations become more and more recognized, it seems to me to be preëminently the duty of every neutral country in time of war to be on the watch, to insist, as far as possible, not only that the existing principles of international law shall be observed, but that everything possible shall be done to extend those principles, to tighten their operation, to strengthen their power, so as to develop out of the elementary beginnings of law which now exist a more complete code for the government of the world.

Well, in the present war have there been questions about which we ought to be jealous? I think there have—questions as to which we should vigilantly inquire. Have we done our duty, have we been keen to see what might be urged which should be not only of use in respect of the present controversy, but might be of extreme importance with respect to the future peaceful relations of the world? You know, probably, there was much discussion on the Continent—not much here—as to the way in which the war between Russia and Japan began. There was no formal declaration of war before an act of war, but there was, it is said, a sufficient warning that a state of war had arisen, and that a warlike act might be expected as the immediate consequence.

Let me point out to you, as friends of peace, the imperative importance of insisting on the principle that war is not to be tolerated—the starting of war between two principals is not to be tolerated, without some warning, some reason on the part of both sides to believe that it is coming. Whatever else we may think about it, it is certain that the great success of the unexpected attack of Japan upon Russia has already strengthened those people who are most eager to maintain and intensify the armed attitude of nations in their arguments that you must always be prepared with the utmost force, because, without any warning, you may be attacked.

Against that we should insist that the law of nations ought never to permit, and does not permit, a warlike act to be begun without such preliminaries as give at least a warning that that act may be expected. I refer for a moment in passing to a phrase used by an English soldier within the last fortnight, which may bring home to some of you the importance of the principle I am now insisting upon. Lord Dundonald, in quitting his command in Canada and calling attention to the state of the country there, used this remarkable phrase: “Canada exists through the forbearance of a neighboring power.” The suggestion, more or less openly expressed, is this—that the United States might at any moment march straight into Canada, and Canada would not be prepared to resist. Well, Canada would not be prepared to resist, if we could conceive of such an iniquity as the United States marching—without notice, without quarrel, without initial discussion, without negotiation, without circumstances leading up to a condition in which war is imminent—marching an army into Canada.

If we are to think of such iniquity as that being possible, as being such as is admissible amongst civilized nations, then, indeed, we must be armed to the teeth against all comers—no man will be safe against his neighbor, no country safe against any other country. It is imperative, I say, to insist that war should never be

begun unless after such circumstances as give fair reason of warning on both sides that war may be expected from either one of them.

I look, said Mr. Courtney, in concluding, as the best preservative of peace, as the real, life-giving fount of peace, to a passionate desire to see fulfilled what has been the dream of the best men for centuries, even for thousands of years, the realization of peace between nations; that instead of the barbarities of war we shall have the brotherhood of peace, that instead of nation being arrayed against nation, animated with the mad desire of mutual destruction, we may see them working side by side, each fulfilling peacefully its proper place in the great organization of the world. I look to that as the first thing we must carry with us in our proselytizing energies, wherever we may go. I look next to the doing of our best to maintain the authority of law, as it has been constituted, and to extend the authority of law in cases where it is still capable of extension, so that governments and nations everywhere, recognizing that there will be built up principles by the application of which, between themselves, they may secure the realization of that vision of peace of which I have spoken. Those doctrines may be supported by your institution, the idea may be supported by your local members, and you may see, with constantly growing force, at The Hague or elsewhere—at The Hague right cheerfully I would accept it—a Court which is, in itself, of slow operation, come to exercise over the nations of the civilized world that great authority which must always tend to the exercise of justice—sane, regulated, wise and liberal justice—amongst nations, as it has been realized amongst individuals.



## War from the Christian Standpoint.

BY CHARLES OSBORNE.

In the present war between Russia and Japan the claim is made by the sympathizers with both sides that it is a fight between Christianity and heathenism. It would seem that those who speak in this way are ignorant either of what Christianity really is or of what war means. We need oftener to go to the root of the whole matter and study the subject from the *Christian* standpoint. If we claim to be Christians the one question for us is this: Can war ever be consistent with the example and the teachings of Christ? This view of the subject is often lost sight of and needs to be emphasized, for the peace of the world will never be secure until it rests on the firm conviction in the minds of Christians that war is wrong. If the Christian church had always acted on this belief, war between civilized nations would have long ago become impossible.

In Charles Sheldon's famous story "In His Steps" we get a glimpse of what the result might be if the members of one church pledged themselves to decide every question by the test, "What would Jesus do if he were in my place"? If we ask this question and answer it honestly it will help us to solve many of the difficult problems of life, and I think all will agree that this test, or something similar, is the only one the Christian should use in determining his conduct. Let us apply the test, "What would Jesus do?" Would He engage in war

under any circumstances? For me there can be but one answer: He would not do it.

This was the view held by the Christian church during the first two centuries. Tertullian, who lived about the year two hundred, is positive in his teaching that war is unlawful for the Christian. He says, "How will a Christian man war without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? In disarming Peter he unbelted every soldier." Other writers of that period claimed that the prophecy, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks," had already been fulfilled because the Christians refused to serve in the army. One of the complaints made against them by their enemies was that they would not fight even when it was necessary. We have the record of Marcellus, a centurion in one of the Roman legions, who became a Christian. One day he threw down his sword and belt at the head of the legion saying he had become a Christian and would serve no longer. He was thrown into prison and afterwards put to death. A young man named Maximilian was brought before the tribunal to be enrolled in the army, but he refused to become a soldier, saying, "I am a Christian and cannot fight." He was told that death would be the penalty if he refused, but he replied, "I cannot fight if I die." He was at once condemned and beheaded. We may search the records of war in vain to find greater acts of heroism than these.

Other cases might be mentioned, if further proof were needed, of the fact that in the earlier and purer days of Christianity, while the teachings of Christ were still fresh in the minds of his followers, they steadily refused to perform military service because they believed he had forbidden it. During these first two centuries the church was a great missionary society, and spread rapidly through the Roman Empire and in many barbarous countries besides; but in many places its members began to lose the purity and simplicity of the earlier time, and in the third century many of them served in the army. The cruel and ambitious Emperor Constantine, who ruled early in the fourth century, found it policy for him to grant toleration to the Christians and afterwards to join them. A dissension arose in the church and the case was brought to him for settlement. After giving his decision three times he thought it was necessary to enforce it by military power. The opposing party resisted, and for the first time (but not the last), we find professed Christians slaughtering one another. From this time Christians were common in the army, and the church rapidly grew corrupt.

It seems strange and sad to think that the church of Christ so soon forgot his teachings and suffered such defeat. It calls to mind the story of the battle of Germantown in the Revolutionary War. The American army attacked the enemy and were at first successful, but, blinded and confused by a fog, they retreated, and instead of enjoying the fruits of the victory that might have been theirs, they withdrew to Valley Forge and passed a winter of hardship and suffering. So Christ sent out the little army of his disciples to conquer the world for him. They used the weapons that he gave them, patiently enduring persecution and meeting with wonderful success. The mighty Roman Empire began to yield to their influence. The victory seemed almost gained, when, blinded by the vision of worldly power,